



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/773,292

02/09/2004

Ji-young Choi

Q79267

1354

23373

7590

11/08/2007

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.

SUITE 800

WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

ROMANO, JOHN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2192

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/08/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	Application No. 10/773,292	Applicant(s) CHOI ET AL.	
	Examiner John J. Romano	Art Unit 2192	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED October 12th, 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, ~~the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered~~ and an explanation of how the ~~new or amended~~ claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-6 and 8-11.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See attached action.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
 13. ☐ Other: _____.

ADVISORY ACTION

Remarks

1. Applicants' response dated October 12th, 2007, responding to the July 12th, 2007 Office action provided in the rejection of claims 1- 6 and 8-11, wherein claims 1- 6 and 8-11, remain pending in the application and which have been fully considered by the examiner.

Prior Art's Arguments – Rejections

2. Applicant's arguments filed October 12th, 2007, in particular on pages 3-4, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. For example,

(A) In regard to the argument the cache 126 is "not separate or distinguishable from the main memory 120", (See response, page 3, 2nd paragraph), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. It should be noted that the plain language of the claim limitation separate is interpreted by the examiner, as being distinguishable or separate (either logically or physically) from the other portions of memory. As pointed out in the previous office action, although the memory of *Blais* may not be physically separate or distinguishable, it is indeed logically separate and distinguishable (See Final Rejection, (7/12/2007) at 3.).

Additionally, as noted in the previous office action, it is noted that *Blais* expressly discloses "retrieved and used" (column 3, line 20) when referring to the cache entry when "loading a class" (column 3, line 9). Of particular interest is *Blais*' express disclosure of the information being "stored in a cache separate from any class file"

Art Unit: 2192

(emphasis added, Column 3, line 8). Here, it is clear that the data is loaded or retrieved from a logically separate cache and then subsequently used. If the data did not need to be loaded or transferred into an execution area (i.e., execution engine, run-time data, etc...) then, it would not need to be retrieved because it would already be present. The act of load or retrieving the cached (stored) data necessarily requires conveying the data to a logically separate memory. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 is maintained as addressed herein-above.

(B) In regard to applicant's argument that "Rodriguez does not make up for the deficiencies of the other applied references" (see response, page 4, 4th paragraph), the examiner notes, and also as pointed out by Applicant, that *Rodriguez* is not relied upon for the respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, the arguments are not persuasive and the rejection is maintained as addressed herein.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Romano whose telephone number is (571) 272-3872. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2192

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JJR



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER